

in defense and that insurance policy for the American people.

□ 1830

THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, in order to start off this period of time where we are going to address some issues that have occurred today, some current articles, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] for an opening statement.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the revelations brought forth this morning in the Wall Street Journal have caused me, along with many of my colleagues, to believe that the Secretary of Energy has crossed a line that goes far beyond the indiscretion, the mismanagement, and the incompetence which have, unfortunately, all too often been the hallmark of Secretary O'Leary's tenure. The Secretary has moved out of the gray area and leapt into an obvious and indefensible abuse of office. I am speaking of her use of taxpayer money to hire private investigators for the purpose of compiling a media enemies list. It is for this reason that we are sending a letter to the President of the United States asking him to demand Secretary O'Leary's immediate resignation.

It is clear that this specific use of taxpayer money is way beyond the pale.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, what we have found in some of the earlier period today, we got a lot of calls in my office where people thought this was more than just wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars, but to use taxpayer dollars to hire a private investigative firm to develop information or an enemies list, as was mentioned in the Wall Street Journal article, goes beyond, as the gentleman says, the gray area, and really crosses the line.

I think we have already started the process here on the floor of the House and around the Hill here of talking with different individuals. They have become very upset at what has happened today on revealing this, that the Secretary of Energy has misused these tax dollars. We have a letter that is, as was mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, going to the President that has almost 70 signature on it now, and it has gained momentum. This is on top of other patterns that have been developing.

Over the last 6 months we have seen several articles in the paper about the travel that has been going on through the Department of Energy. Secretary O'Leary often takes many people with her when she travels. She upgrades to

first class, stays at resorts or four-star hotels, and has really been living the good life on taxpayers' money.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman will continue to yield on that point, I think it is an ironic footnote that in fact when the White House, finding out about this, tried to determine where the Secretary was today, it turns out that, of course, the Secretary was not in Washington. In fact, the Secretary was in Louisiana raising money for the Democratic candidate for Governor in Louisiana, and had to be asked to come back to the White House to speak, apparently, to Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, to explain, and perhaps more than to explain her actions in this regard.

Mr. TIAHRT. Once again, the travel budget seems to be the issue here. I think, again, we are just noting that this is a pattern that has been developing of wasteful management. Even Vice President GORE, in his National Performance Review, looked at the Department of Energy and found that in the environmental management portion, that they were 40 percent inefficient, citing that over the next 70 years it could cost taxpayers up to \$30 billion if we do not do something about it.

Also we have found that the Department of Energy was 20 percent behind in their milestones, which means they are behind schedule in one out of five projects. So we have a pattern developing of poor management of the taxpayers' dollars.

Then we come to this morning's article, which says that this private investigative firm that was paid for out of taxpayer dollars was developing an enemies list, and we find out that Senator DOLE is at the top of the list. Other Members of Congress were also involved. I heard from a member of the Department of Energy that I was also on the list, at No. 13. I think that is a very unlucky number for the Secretary.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman will yield for a question, what do you suppose would be the reaction of your constituents if you were to spend \$100 out of your official account to investigate and rate the media as to how they report on your official proceedings?

Mr. TIAHRT. The gentleman brings up a good point. All of us wonder how we are doing in the media, but none of us that I know of take taxpayer dollars and hire a private investigation firm to go in and do that, act for us. We all read the clips ourselves and make kind of a mental tally, but we do not misuse taxpayer dollars. I think that is the important difference between what goes on in Congress and what is going on in the Department of Energy, with the Secretary of Energy.

Mr. HOKE. I think it speaks for itself. It is just incredible. As the President's own press secretary, Mike McCurrie, said today, "On the face of it, it is simply unacceptable." When he was asked if she would be asked to resign, McCurrie said, "I don't want to

speculate on that." I think the time has come when 68 of our colleagues agree, and counting, that the time has come for the Secretary to resign.

CLARIFYING THE RECORD WITH REGARD TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes wild rumors float in the press that just come out of the thin air. The gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, one of our dearest friends and a Navy captain, retired in the Reserve, I mean an active captain in the Reserve, is the chairman of our Committee on National Security, sometimes referred to as the Committee on Armed Services.

His five subcommittee chairmen, of which I am one, and the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, spoke for 5 minutes earlier, we stand behind him foursquare. This is an absolute fantasy that anybody in our conference, all 233 of us, to be 234 tomorrow, and 235 after the 18th of this month, a friend just told me, the 235 of us love FLOYD SPENCE, a great leader. The military men and women across this country in every service, and across this world, think this is one outstanding chairman of our Committee on National Security. Please kill the rumor before the regular tabloid press picks it up.

MISUSE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY BY HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PUTTING TO REST RUMORS ABOUT CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, along the vein of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], I am a Congressman from South Carolina, and I am so glad to hear this put to a rest. This is a funny town where rumors can start without any basis. I think that was something that needed to be said. I congratulate the gentleman for saying it, because the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, has been a great Member of Congress, he has been a good chairman, and serves his country well.

The reason I really want to share a few minutes with those that are listening tonight is that I live in the Third Congressional District, and the Savannah River site is the largest DOE industrial facility in the chain. I have been told that, and I believe that to be correct. We have lost about 8,900 people due to layoffs in the last few years where we are trying to downsize the

Department of Energy, make it more efficient, get better use of taxpayer dollars. Then to wake up and read the newspaper and find that the Department of Energy chief, Ms. Hazel O'Leary, Cabinet member, has taken \$43,500 of public money to go out and investigate the media, rate newspapers, rate reporters, try to coerce those who give bad stories, in her opinion, to give better stories, that is at least two, maybe three jobs at the Savannah River site.

Along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who made this amendment, can you imagine what would happen to a Member of Congress if they did such a thing? They should lose their job, and so should Ms. O'Leary. This is really an offensive event. It was one of many events that show there is no leadership over in the Department of Energy. I think it is a good example of what happens when an agency continues to grow with no clear mission or well-defined purpose. All of a sudden, it is more important what people think of you than what you are actually doing.

I would just like to let everyone know that I find it highly inappropriate for the Department of Energy chief to take \$43,500 of hard-earned public money and try to recreate her image at a time when we are downsizing the Department and we are making hard decisions throughout the land. The problem with the Department of Energy is not an image problem, it is a substance problem. We need to have a well-defined, clearly-defined energy policy. We need to clean these sites up instead of talking about it. We need to get on and develop our national defense needs, like tritium production, which is within the venue of the Department of Energy.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield on that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time talking about travel, and now this silliness where the Secretary has actually spent money, she is so paranoid apparently, about the way the Department itself, as well as she, personally, is being perceived in the press that she is spending taxpayer dollars to have reporters investigated.

But what is really at stake here is the fact that the primary responsibility of the Department of Energy is the warehousing and safeguarding of our nuclear weapons stockpile. Think about it. We are talking about bombs that can wipe out this Earth many, many times over.

When we cannot even have a Secretary and a Department that can control its own travel, its own spending, and is so paranoid that it is checking up on reporters in that way, that bodes terribly, terribly poorly for this core mission, which is critically important. We are not talking about muckraking for political benefit, here. What we are talking about is an extraordinarily important responsibility that rests with

the Secretary of the Department of Energy.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a bill going forward that says that we are trying to reduce the redundancy in government and eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet level agency. I think this shows that this individual will take any means necessary to prevent the needed cuts to take place in her bureaucracy, even to the point of going and investigating some of the other reporters and Members of Congress, as well as reporters. I think that, as 68 others have, I will join and call for the resignation of the Secretary of Energy.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may, Mr. Speaker, the article to which we are referring has a unique comment in it. A DOE official responded concerning the spending of \$43,500 to go out and investigate media outlets and reporters who report on the Department of Energy, favorable or unfavorable ratings, and made the comment:

A reporter's unfavorable rating meant we weren't getting our message across, that we needed to work on this person a little.

To me, that is a statement beyond belief, that again, if I as a Member of Congress took taxpayer money entrusted to my care to go out and work on somebody to make me look better, I should lose my job.

A HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO BALANCE THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are in a historic time right now for the House of Representatives and for the Congress generally. We have the opportunity for the first time since 1969 to in fact balance the budget. People say, "What do you mean by balance the budget? Doesn't the country already do that?" No, it is an unfortunate tale, but not since 1969 have we balanced the budget. School boards balance their budgets, county governments do, State governments and family budgets as well as corporations make sure they do not spend more than they bring in, but the Federal Government for many years, when they have more money that they have spent than they brought in, it just becomes a tax increase. Now we are up to almost \$5 trillion in years of Congresses, House and Senate and prior Congresses, basically spending more than they bring in.

I think the message we have heard from all of our districts, all 435 across the country in all 50 States, is that while we want direct services that the Federal Government can provide that are not already provided by the State government or the private sector, let us make sure we eliminate the fraud,

abuse, and waste. That is what this Congress is trying to do.

By balancing the budget, we are going to be able to achieve lower interest payments for those who own a house and are paying a mortgage, we will be able to lower the interest payments for cars, for people who are buying a vehicle over time, we will be able to lower the cost of college education, and, by balancing the budget, we will in fact increase the opportunities for companies to expand, to grow, and to hire. By having more employment and more people contributing to the tax base, we will stabilize the tax base.

We are on the threshold of an historic Congress in that we have passed the balanced budget, we will have passed tax reform, giving young people the opportunity to have an education, to have an elder care tax credit, to have a rollback of the 1993 increase of the Social Security tax, to allow seniors under that same tax reform proposals to be able to in fact earn more than \$11,280 without a deduction in their Social Security. They will be able to earn up to \$30,000 a year.

That will reduce the capital gains tax to 19 percent for individuals, 25 percent for companies, thus increasing job opportunities, savings, and expansion of businesses, and as well, we will have an adoption tax credit of \$5,000 for families who are trying to adopt a child. All of these are pro-business, pro-people ideas to help seniors, to help working class individuals, to help our young people.

We want to make sure that the next generation of children is not born with such a heavy debt, and by having the heavy debt it makes it harder to get a job, it makes it harder to keep a job, it makes it harder to enjoy the quality of life that we want to have that is better than we had. We can make sure that we build upon the American dream by working together in a bipartisan fashion to balance our budget, to make sure that we have businesses that are thriving, and to make sure that services that have to be performed by the Federal Government do not have all the bureaucratic red tape and the unnecessary costs that have occasioned them in previous years.

□ 1845

So I am looking forward to a final reconciliation bill, a final legislation dealing with the House and Senate, working together and hopefully also having the President's assistance as well, to make sure that we do what the American people want, and that is balance the budget, reduce spending that is wasteful, reduce excessive cost, and provide the services that people need without bankrupting the Nation.

JOLTED BY WORLD EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman